UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/626,063	07/26/2000	Louri Brylov	10001122.1	8584

22879 7590 04/07/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	3

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/626,063	BRYLOV, LOURI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S PARK	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 July 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 July 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Perhaps, "scan devices 16 and 21" should be "scan devices 16 and 22" on page 4, line 21.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 17-20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Camara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,373,507 (hereinafter Camara).

2. With respect to claim 1, Camara teaches a method for scanning and transferring images to a destination location, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a scanner icon ("my scanner" icon in fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 5-7); and

associating said scanner icon with a destination location (col. 5, lines 31-39), wherein the step of:

associating said scanner icon with a destination location further includes the steps of scanning a document using a scanner (col. 5, lines 47-61); and

transmitting said scanned document to said destination location for storage (col. 5, lines 62-67).

3. With respect to claim 2, Camara teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of associating said scanner icon with a destination location further includes the step of:

connecting said scanner associated with said scanner icon to said destination location.

Since the scanned image data is transferred to the remote computer's memory from the scanner, the connection between the two is established inherently (col. 5, lines 12-20 & 62-67). Therefore, Camara inherently teaches the method as specified in claim 2.

4. With respect to claim 7, Camara teaches the method of claim 1, further including the step of:

determining if said scanned document requires conversion to a different document format type (col. 5, lines 21-22).

5. With respect to claim 8, Camara teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the step of determining if said scanned document requires conversion further includes the step of:

converting said scanned document to a selected document format if said scanned document requires conversion (col. 5, lines 21-30).

Further, note that the scanned document is sent to a facsimile or a PC by an email format based on a user's command. Since the facsimile requires different image format than that of the PC, the conversion is inherently performed accordingly.

6. With respect to claim 17, Camara discloses a system for scanning and transferring images to a destination location comprising:

a scanner for capturing a scanned document (col. 5, lines 47-61); and

a transferring mechanism for transferring said scanned document generated by said scanner to said destination location for storage (col. 5, lines 62-67).

7. With respect to claim 18, Camara discloses the system of claim 17, wherein said transferring mechanism further comprises:

an icon selecting mechanism for selecting a scanner icon associated with said scanner to generate a scanned document ("my scanner" icon in fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 5-7). Also refer to the claim 1 rejection.

8. With respect to claim 19, Camara discloses the system of claim 17, wherein said transferring mechanism further comprises:

a destination selection mechanism (destination 130 in fig. 5) for indicating said destination location for receiving said scanned document (col. 5, lines 62-67).

9. With respect to claim 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

10. With respect to claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 7 and 8, are applicable.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 17-20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Machida U.S. Patent No. 6,642,943.

11. With respect to claim 1, Machida teaches a method for scanning and transferring images to a destination location, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a scanner icon (scanner icon in fig. 5 and col. 10, lines 48-51); and

associating said scanner icon with a destination location (printer) (col. 10, line 46 – col. 11, line 5), wherein the step of:

associating said scanner icon with a destination location further includes the steps of scanning a document using a scanner (col. 10, lines 58-60); and

transmitting said scanned document to said destination location for storage (col. 10, lines 58-60).

Although particular example discloses data transmission between a scanner and a printer to execute a copying function, Machida teaches that the invention is not only limited to the two devices (col. 46, lines 55-67). Therefore, the Office interprets that the scanner can be combined with a PC or other devices shown in fig. 5 for storing the scanned image data in the PC when the scanner icon is dragged and dropped to the PC icon.

12. With respect to claim 2, Machida teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of associating said scanner icon with a destination location further includes the step of:

connecting said scanner associated with said scanner icon to said destination location.

Since the scanned image data is transferred to the remote printer from the scanner, the connection between the two is established inherently (col. 10, line 46 – col. 11, line 5). Therefore, Machida inherently teaches the method as specified in claim 2.

13. With respect to claim 7, Machida teaches the method of claim 1, further including the step of:

determining if said scanned document requires conversion to a different document format type (col. 28, lines 21-24).

14. With respect to claim 8, Machida teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the step of determining if said scanned document requires conversion further includes the step of:

converting said scanned document to a selected document format if said scanned document requires conversion (col. 28, lines 25-34).

15. With respect to claim 17, Machida discloses a system for scanning and transferring images to a destination location comprising:

a scanner for capturing a scanned document (col. 10, lines 58-60); and

a transferring mechanism for transferring said scanned document generated by said scanner to said destination location for storage (col. 10, lines 58-60).

Although particular example discloses data transmission between a scanner and a printer to execute a copying function, Machida teaches that the invention is not only limited to the two devices (col. 46, lines 55-67). Therefore, the Office interprets that the scanner can be combined with a PC or other devices shown in fig. 5 for storing the

scanned image data in the PC when the scanner icon is dragged and dropped to the PC icon.

16. With respect to claim 18, Machida discloses the system of claim 17, wherein said transferring mechanism further comprises:

an icon selecting mechanism for selecting a scanner icon associated with said scanner to generate a scanned document (scanner icon in fig. 5 and col. 10, lines 48-51). Also refer to the claim 1 rejection.

17. With respect to claim 19, Machida discloses the system of claim 17, wherein said transferring mechanism further comprises:

a destination selection mechanism (printer icon in fig. 5) for indicating said destination location for receiving said scanned document (col. 10, line 46 – col. 11, line 5).

18. With respect to claim 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

19. With respect to claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 7 and 8, are applicable.

Claims 9, 10, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Camara.

20. With respect to claim 9, Camara discloses a system for scanning images to a browser (figs. 4 & 5), comprising:

means for selecting a scanner icon ("my scanner" icon in fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 5-7);

means for associating said scanner icon with a destination location (col. 5, lines 31-39);

means for scanning a document (col. 5, lines 47-61); and

means for transmitting said scanned document to the destination location for storage (col. 5, lines 62-67).

Since the scanner disclosed in the Camara reference is a remote scanner that is connected over a network, when a user views and selects the scanner icon to preview the scanned image, the Office interprets that the browser displaying the scanner information and the image is a web page.

Further, displaying network devices and scanned images in the web site is well known in the art at the time of the invention. Since Camara discloses a system for previewing the scanned image, it would have been obvious to implement software that supports the displaying the image in the web site. Thus, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

21. With respect to claim 10, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

22. With respect to claim 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7, are applicable.

23. With respect to claim 16, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 8, are applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Watanabe U.S. Patent No. 6,144,468.

24. With respect to claims 3 and 4, Camara teaches the method of claim 2 but it does not teach expressly the method of determining if an ADF is connected to said scanner.

Watanabe, the same field of endeavor of scanner, teaches the method of determining if an ADF is connected to a scanner. When the ADF is not connected to the scanner, a control unit 100 in an image forming apparatus decides to scan an image directly placed on the glass of scanner unit 101 (default scanning mode) (col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 3).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of determining the presence of the ADF taught by Watanabe with the scanner of Camara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to scan image data from the ADF when the ADF is connected in the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Camara and Watanabe to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3 and 4.

Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Nakatsuma et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,115,132 (hereinafter Nakatsuma).

25. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Camara teaches the method of claim 2 but it does not teach expressly the method of determining if said destination location is a supported location.

Nakatsuma, the same field of endeavor of data transmission in network, teaches the method of determining if said destination location is a supported location (col. 18, lines 51-55) and switching said destination location to a default location (default printer) if said destination location is not said supported location (col. 18, liens 55-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of switching the destination printer to a default printer with the method of image data transmission to the PC from the scanner taught by Camara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a default destination device for storing the scanned data when the destination PC due to an error cannot support the image data transmission.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Camara and Nakatsuma to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 6.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machida as applied to claims 2 and 10 above, and further in view of Watanabe.

26. With respect to claims 3 and 4, Machida teaches the method of claim 2 and a method optionally installing an ADF system in a scanner in a copying machine but it does not teach expressly the method of determining if an ADF is connected to said scanner.

Watanabe, the same field of endeavor of scanner, teaches the method of determining if an ADF is connected to a scanner. When the ADF is not connected to the scanner, a control unit 100 in an image forming apparatus decides to scan an image directly placed on the glass of scanner unit 101 (default scanning mode) (col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 3).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of determining the presence of the ADF taught by Watanabe with the scanner of Machida.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to scan image data from the ADF when the ADF is connected in the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Machida and Watanabe to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3 and 4.

Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machida as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Nakatsuma.

27. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Machida teaches the method of claim 2 but it does not teach expressly the method of determining if said destination location is a supported location.

Nakatsuma, the same field of endeavor of data transmission in network, teaches the method of determining if said destination location is a supported location (col. 18, lines 51-55) and switching said destination location to a default location (default printer) if said destination location is not said supported location (col. 18, liens 55-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of switching the destination printer to a default printer with the method of image data transmission to a PC or a printer from the scanner taught by Machida.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a default destination device for storing the scanned data when the destination PC or printer due to an error cannot support the image data transmission.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Machida and Nakatsuma to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 6.

28. With respect to claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3, are applicable.

29. With respect to claim 12, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

30. With respect to claim 13, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

31. With respect to claim 14, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Watanabe and Nakatsuma.

32. With respect to claims 21-23, Machida teaches the method of claim 2 but it does not disclose expressly the system for determining if an ADF is connected to the said scanner and if said destination location is a supported location.

Watanabe, the same field of endeavor of scanner, teaches the method of determining if an ADF is connected to a scanner. When the ADF is not connected to the scanner, a control unit 100 in an image forming apparatus decides to scan an image directly placed on the glass of scanner unit 101 (default scanning mode) (col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 3).

Nakatsuma, the same field of endeavor of data transmission in network, teaches the method of determining if said destination location is a supported location (col. 18, lines 51-55) and switching said destination location to a default location (default printer) if said destination location is not said supported location (col. 18, liens 55-65).

As noted above, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system for determining the presence of the ADF disclosed by Watanabe with the scanner of Camara, and further to implement the method of switching the destination printer to a default printer to the combined system of Camara and Watanabe.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to scan image data from the ADF when the ADF is connected in the system and to provide a default destination device for storing the scanned data when the destination PC due to an error cannot support the image data transmission.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all three inventions to obtain the invention as specified in claims 21-23.

Contact Information

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

csp
March 23, 2004

EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600